

rush because we want to separate tax issues on Final Reading when we get into May. We have the rules, these are the ways it's going to go, the votes are there for 240, it will be on Final Reading, and it will take its chances as with the little guys, like 145. And those are the rules we need to go. So I will oppose the motion to suspend the rules to read it because I suspect that, if we start along this process, those bills that also have A bills, I would suspect a lot of other motions that might be filed, and that's simply not the way we need to go. The little guys need to be treated just as important, and our rules need to be followed just as much for them as with the big bills as well. And that's my only reason for opposing this motion. And, again, I may be very supportive on 240 when it gets to Final Reading, because I do think getting rid of the cliff effect was very, very important. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to strenuously support the suspension of the...of the rule. I appreciate the argument, probably because I've made it myself many times, that if you make an exception of any kind, it becomes more difficult not to make other exceptions. But there...it seems to me that one thing that you ought to keep in mind, Senator Landis made reference to it, you know, if you think the distribution of income tax by brackets is wrong in 240, you ought to vote no on it today, tomorrow, yesterday, whatever day. If you think the distribution between income tax brackets is better than what is current law, then you ought to vote yes today, tomorrow, next month, whenever. If you need to change...that's the only issue in 240, from my viewpoint, is the distribution the way...for income tax, by income tax brackets reasonably equitable in your mind. If we need to raise more money, and should you choose to increase income tax, the law currently in 240 does not change the provision for primary or base rate for income tax, currently 3.7, and if it's...and LB 21, which was indicated by Senator Landis and the Revenue Committee, does exactly that, it provides for the method to change that primary rate at any point you want. Each one-tenth of one percent raises a little over \$8 million, if that was the route you want to go. That's the vehicle you ought to use if you want to increase income tax, because regardless of how much income tax you want to raise, whether you want to lower the base rate or increase the base rate, the internal equity between